BRYAN'S PLAIN TALK

Discusses Paramount Questions of the Democratic Platform.

EVILS OF REPUBLICAN POLICIES.

Bights of the People in United States and Acquired Territories-Dangers of Imperialism and Militarism-The True Republic.

In response to the tender of the nom-Ination for the presidency by the notification committee of the democracy, at William J. Bryan said:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee: I shall, at an early day, and in a more formal manner, accept the nomination which you tender, and I shall at that time discuss the various quesshall at that time discuss the various ques-tions covered by the democratic platform. It may not be out of place, however, to submit a few observations at this time upon the general character of the contest before us, and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance

in this campaign.

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other, I do not mean to say that all our opponents have delib-grately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the government, but I do assert that on the important issues of the day the repubiican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to elevate pecuniary considerations and ignore human rights.

In 1859 Lincoln said that the republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. This is the proper relation which should exist between the two. Man, the handwork of God, the two. Man, the handlwork of God, comes first; money, the handlwork of man, is of inferior importance. Man is the master, money the servant; but upon all important questions to-day, republican legislation tends to make money the master

and man the servant.

The maxim of Jefferson, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and the doctrine of Lincoln that this should be a government "of the people, by the people and for the people," are being disregarded and the instrumentalities of government are being used to advance the interests of those who are in a position to secure favors. those who are in a position to secure favors from the government.

The Desire of Democracy.

The democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, econ-omy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stim-ulus to honest toil, when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the pro ceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are re-spected. Democracy strives for a civiliza-

will share according to his merits.

No one has a right to expect from soclety more than a fair compensation for
the service which he renders to society. If he secures more, it is at the expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class tegislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another, the democratic party says: "Thou

Republican Excuses.

Against us are arrayed a comparatively small, but politically and financially powerful, number who really profit by republican policies; but with them are associated a large number who, because of their atthe former teachings of their own party! Republicans who used to advocate bimetalism, now try to convince themselves that the gold standard is good; republicans who were formerly attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the nation's paper money; republicans who used to boast that the republican party was paying off the national debt, are now looking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; republicans who formerly abhorred a trust, now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; republicans who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the objections which are urged against a large increase in the permanent military establishment; In the permanent military establishment; republicans who gloried in our independence when the nation was less powerful, now look with favor upon a foreign alliance; republicans who three years ago condemned "forcible annexation" as immoral and even criminal, are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partisenship has already bilinded many to present dangers is certain; how large a portion to the republican party can be grawn over
to the new policies remains to be seen.
For a time republican leaders were inclined to deny to opponents the right to
criticise the Philippine policy of the administration, but upon investigation they
thought that both Lincoin and Clay asserted and exercised the right to criticise a
president during the progress of the Mextoan wat.

In view of the criticism which my ac-

fication committee of the democracy, at any difference as to the great importance Indianapolis, Wednesday, August 8, of the question and there is no difference

cused the opponents of imperiation of siving encouragement to the Filipines. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine islands permanently and imitate European empires in the government of colonies, the republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject faces to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their ability. The Filiphios do not need any encouragement from Amer-

spoken can never be recalled. It is true. It goes on and on, and no one can set a limit to its ever widening influence. But if it were possible to obliterate every word written or spoken in defense of the prin-ciples set forth in the declaration of independence, a war of conquest would still leave its legacy of perpetual hatred, for it was God Himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master. Lincoln said that the safety of this nation

was not in its fleets, its armies or its forts, but in the spirit which prizes liberty and the heritage of all men, in all lands, every-where; and he warned his countrymen that they could not destroy this spirit without planting the seeds of despotism at their

Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effect upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weaken ing that principle here. Paralyzing Imperialism.

Even now we are beginning to see the paralyzing influence of imperialism. Here-tofore, this nation has been prompt to ex-press its sympathy with those who were fighting for civil liberty. While our sphere of activity has been limited to the western hemisphere, our sympathies have not been bounded by the seas. We have felt it due to ourselves and to the world, as well as to those who were struggling for the right to govern themselves, to pro-

stitle secured in some gaverers I take this constants the reasons given as that time. I blought it safe to trust the constant the reasons given as that time. I blought it safe to trust the constant the reasons given as that time. I blought it safe to trust the constant that time I blought it safe to trust the constant the proposed of the proposed to diplomacy publishment of that purpose to diplomacy in the acked. The proposed is a strain that the proposed is a strain that the same reasons are the same treats which have been being the safe to the same treats against the next that the same successful contest against the next the same treats which is not the same treats against the same treats ag while they rule the natives.

Increase in Regular Army.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a large standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will justify the forcible annexation of the Philippine islands will justify the seizure of other Islands and the domination of other people, and with wars of conquest we can expect a certain, if not rapid, growth of our military establishment. That a large permanent increase in our regular army is intended by the republican leaders is not a mere matter of conjecture, but a matter of fact. In his message of December 5, 1898, the president asked for authority to increase the standing army to 100,000. In 1896 the army contained about 25,000 men. Within two years the president asked for four times that many, and a republican house of representatives complied with the request after the Spanish treaty had been signed and no country was at war with the United States. If such an army is demanded when an imperial policy, is contemplated, but not openly avowed, what may be expected if the people encourage the republican party by indorsing its policy at the polls? A large standing army is not only a pecuntary burden to the people and, if accompanied by compulsory service, a constant source of irritation, but it is every menace to a republican form of government. The army is the personification of force, and militarism will inevitably change the ideals of the people and turn the thoughts of our young men from the arts of peace to the science of war. The government which relies for its defense upon its citizens is more likely to be just than one which has at call a large body of professional soldiers. A small standing army and a well equipped and well disciplined state militia are sufficient in ordinary times, and in an emergency the nation should in the future as in the past place its dependence upon the volunteers who come from all occupations at their country's call and return to productive labor when their services are no longer required—men w

phasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. The republican platform says that "the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them (the Filipinos) by law." This is a strange doctrine for a government which owes its very existence to the men who offered their lives as a protest against government without consent and taxation without representation. In what respect does ment without consent and taxation without representation. In what respect does
the position of the republican party differ
from the position taken by the English
government in 1776? Did not the English
government promise a good government
to the colonists? What king ever promised a bad government to his people? Did not the English government promise that the colonists should
have the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and
English duties? Did not the Spanish government promise to give to the Cubans English duties? Did not the Spanish government promise to give to the Cubans the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and Spanish duties? The whole difference between a monarchy and a republic may be summed up in one sentence. In a monarchy the king gives to the people what he believes to be a good government; in a republic the people secure for themselves what they believe to be a good government. The republican party has accepted the European idea and planted itself upon the ground taken by George III. and by every ruler who distrusts the capacity of the people for self-government or denies them a voice in their own affairs.

of an exercised the right to criticine a president current the second of The President's Will the Only Law

Force Creates No Right.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine islands permanently and imitate European empires in the government of colonies, the republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject faces to protest against such a polity and to resist to the extent of their ability. The Philippine do not need any encouragement from Americans now living. Our whole history has been an encouragement, not only to the Filippines but to all who are denied a voice in their own government. If the republicans are prepared to censure all who have used language calculated to make the Filippines hate foreign domination, let them condemn, the speech of Patrick Henry. When he uttered that passionate appeal; "Give me liberty or give me death," he expressed a sentiment which still echoes in the hearts of men. Let them censure Jefferson; of all the statesmen of history, none have used words so offensive to these who would hold their fellows in political bendage. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must efferson; of all the statesmen of history, in the hearts of men. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must efferson; of all the statesmen of history, in the hearts of men. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must be ferred on the colonists must be declared that the colonists must be declared that the principles enunciated at pipilos. The ferred of the states of popular government when the colonists must be declared that the principles enunciated at pipilos. The democratic platform describes who would hold their fellows in political points and prominence has been boild enough to advocate such a proposition. The McEnery resolution, adopted to the cubans. The democratic platform describes in the hearts of men, Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must be described by the state of limitations has run against the ferred proposition. The McEnery resolution, adopted to the cubans. The filippine of the sta it be our duty to usurp political rights which belong to others? Can it be our duty to kill those who, following the example of our forefathers, love liberty well enough

to kill those who, following the example of our forefathers, love liberty well enough to fight for it?

Some poet has described the terror which overcame a soldier who, in the midst of battle, discovered that he had slain his brother. It is written: "All ye are brethren." Let us hope for the coming of the day when human life—which, when once destroyed, cannot be restored—will be so sacred that it will never be taken except when necessary to punish a crime already committed, or to prevent a crime about to be committed.

If it is said that we have assumed before the world obligations which make it necessary for us to permanently maintain a government in the Philippine islands, I reply, first, that the highest obligation of this nation is to be true to itself. No obligation to any particular nation, or to all nations combined, can require the abandonment of our theory of government and the substitution of doctrines against which our whole national life has been a protest. And, second, that our obligations to the Filipinos, who inhabit the islands, are greater than any obligations which we can owe to foreigners who have a temporary residence in the Philippines or desire to trade there.

Capacity of Self-Government.

Capacity of Self-Government.

Capacity of Self-Government.

It is argued by some that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government and that therefore we owe it to the world to take control of them. Admiral Dewey, in an official report to the navy department, declared the Filipinos more capable of self-government than the Cubans, and said that he based his opinion upon a knowledge of both races. But I will not rest the case upon the relative advancement of the Filipinos. Henry Clay, in defending the rights of the people of South America to self-government, said:

"It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then remanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence Himself, to suppose that He has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man."

Clay was right. There are degrees of proficiency in the art of self-government, but it is a reflection upon the Creator to say that He denied to any people the capacity of self-government. Once admit that some people are capable of self-government, and that others are not, and that the capable people have a right to selze upon and govern the incapable, and you make force—brute force—the only foundation of government and invite the relign of the despot. I am not willing to believe that an all-wise and an all-loving God created the Filipinos, and the fight that foats over our dead, but when the treaty with Mexico was signed American authority withdrew to the Rio Grande, and I venture the opinion that during the last 50 years the people of Mexico have made mere progress under the stimulus of independence and self-government than they would have been had the latter crushed by an imperialistic policy, disguised as "benevolent assimilation."

Responsibility o

can do whatever it desires to do, but it must accept responsibility for what it does. If the constitution stands in the way, the people can amend the constitution. I repeat, the nation can do whatever it desires to do, but it cannot avoid the natural and legitimate results of its own conduct. The young man upon reaching his majority can do what he pleases. He can disregard the teachings of his parents; he can trample upon all that he has been taught to consider sacred; he can disobey the laws of the state, the laws of society and the laws of God. He can stamp failure upon his life and make his very existence a curse to his fellow men, and he can bring his father and mother in sorrow to the grave; but he cannot annul the sentence: "The wages of sin is death." And so with this nation. It is of age, and it can do what it pleases; it can spurn the traditions of the past; it can repudiate the principles upon which the nation rests; it can employ force instead of reason; it can substitute might for right; it can conquer weaker people; it can exploit their lands, appropriate their property and kill their people; but it cannot repeal the moral faw or escape the punishment decreed for the violation of human rights.

"Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,

"Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,
Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
Who taketh another's liberty,
His freedom is also lost.
Would we win as the strong have ever won,
Make ready to pay the debt,
For the God who reigned over Babylon
is the God who is reigning yet."

Is the God who reigning yet."

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Be not deceived. If we expect to maintain a colonial policy we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are.

First, That we must improve the present opportunity to become a world power and enter into international politics.

Second, That our commercial interests in the Philippine islands and in the orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently.

Third, That the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial polity.

Fourth, That there is no honorable re-

policy.

Fourth, That there is no honorable re-treat from the position which the nation has taken.

The first argument is addressed to the nation's pride and the second to the nation's pocketbook. The third is intended for the church member and the fourth for

Growth of a Principle.

Growth of a Principle.

It is a sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten decades it has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power, but it has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the world combined. Because our declaration of independence was promulgated, others have been promulgated. Because the patriots of 1776 fought for liberty others have fought for it; because our constitution was adopted, other constitutions have been adopted. The growth of the principle of self-government, planted on American soil, has been the overshadowing political fact of the nineteenth century. It has made this nation conspicuous among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed. Nothing has been able to check the onward march of this idea. I am not willing that this nation snall cast aside the omnipotent weapon of truth to seize again the weapon of physical warfare. I would not exchange the giory of this republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

The permanent chairman of the last re-

means within the province of government and constitution, we mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is based upon the theory that war can be rightly waged for pecuniary advantage, and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and violence. Franklin denied both of these propositions. When Lord Howe asserted that the acts of parliament, which brought on the revolution, were necessary to prevent American trade from passing into foreign channels, Franklin replied:

"To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, how valuable soever, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood; that the true and sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies. I consider this war against us, therefore, as both unjust and unwise."

I place the philosophy of Franklin against the sordid doctrine of those who would put a price upon the life of an American soldier and justify a war of conquest upon the ground that it will pay. The democratic party is in favor of the expansion of trades. It would extend our trade by every legitimate and peaceful means; but it is not willing to make merchandise of human blood.

But a war of conquest is as unwise as it is unrighteous. A harbor and coaling station in the Philippines would answer every trade and military necessity and such a concession could have been secured at any time without difficulty.

It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them. We carry on trade to-day with every part of the world, and our commerce has expanded more rapidly than the commerce of any European empire. We do not own Japan or China, but we trade with them. Trade cannot be permanently profitable unless it is voluntary. When trade is secured by force, the cost of securing it and retaining it must be taken out of the profits, and the

Evils of Imperialism.

Evils of Imperialism.

Imperialism would be profitable to the army contractors; it would be profitable to the shipowners, who would carry live soldiers to the Philippines and bring dead soldiers back; it would be profitable to those who would seize upon the franchises, and it would be profitable to those who would seize upon the franchises, and it would be profitable to the officials whose salaries would be fixed here and paid over there; but to the farmer, to the laboring man and to the vast majority of those engaged in other occupations, it would bring expenditure without return and risk without reward.

Farmers and laboring men have, as a rule, small incomes, and, under systems which place the tax upon all consumption, pay more than their fair share of the expenses of sovernment. Thus the very people who receive least benefit from imperialism will be injured most by the military burdens which accompany it.

In addition to the evils which he and the farmer share in common, the laboring man will be the first to suffer if oriental subjects seek work in the United States; the first to suffer if American capital leaves our shores to employ oriental labor in the Philippines to supply the trade of China and Japan; the first to suffer from the violence which the military spirit arouses, and the first to suffer when the methods of imperialism are applied to our own government.

It is not strange, therefore, that the labor organizations have been quick to note the approach of these dangers and prompt to protest against both militarism and imperialism.

The pecuniary argument, though more

tronger and happier than they would have been had the former been cursed and the latter crushed by an imperialistic polcy, disguised as "benevolent assimilation."

Responsibility of the Nation.

"Can we not govern colonies?" we are isked. The question is not what we can to, but what we ought to do. This nation

members of one branch of the Christian church; but the principle involved is one of much wider application and challenges serious consideration.

The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands, for their good and our glory, to the exultation of the minister who said that we ought to "thrash the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet sent, every cannon shot and every flag waved means righteousness."

No Gatling Gossip.

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one place unless we are willing to apply it everywhere. If there is poison in the blood of the hand it will ultimately reach the heart. It is equally true that forcibic Christianity, if planted under the American flag in the far-away orient, will sooner arilater be transplanted upon American soil. If true Christianity consists in carrying out in our daily lives the teachings of Christ, who will say that we are commended to civilize with dynamite and proelyte with the sword? He who would deslare the Divine will must prove his authority either by Holy Writ or by evidence of special dispensation. The command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," has no Gatling gun attachment. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive Him, some of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from Heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them, and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose He had said: "We will thrash them until they understand who we are," how different would have been the history of Christianity! Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the Golden Rule and the command.a.ent, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Love, not force, was the weapon-of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart. A missionary recently told me that the stars and stripes once saved his life because his assailant recognized our flag as a flag that had no blood upon it. Let it be known that instead of sovereignty; let it be known that stastad of being the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help and to uplift, having their loins girt about with truth and their feet shod with the Philippine islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands oncessary is

An Honorable Solution.

among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed. Nothing has been able to check the onward march of this idea. I am not willing that this nation shall cast aside the omnipotent weapon of truth to seize again the weapon of bysical warfare. I would not exchange the glory of this republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

The permanent chairman of the last republican national convention presented the pecuniary argument in all its boldiness, when he said:

"We make no hypocritical pretenses of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of these people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselve as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means within the province of government and constitution, we mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is been as a seed to the commercial argument. It is been the province of government in the siand of cluba; section of the plining of the nation's purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine stands, fust as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the Philippine stands, fust as we have promised to give independence to the Filipinos, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba. An European protectorate gives to the nation protectorate gives to the nation protected the advanged to the same and the province of government in the stand of the province of government in the plant of the plant of the province of government in the plant of the plant of the province of government in the plant of the plant of

gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a sheld to neighboring republics and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us. After the Filipinos had aided us in the war against Spain, we could not honorably turn them over to their former masters; we could not leave them to be the victims of the ambitious designs of the European nations, and since we do not desire to make them a part of upon the country of the country

MILY.

nd no Pond